

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reexamination of the captioned application is respectfully requested.

A. SUMMARY OF THIS AMENDMENT

By the current amendment, Applicants basically:

1. Editorially amend the specification.
2. Amend claims 3, 5 and 8.
3. Add new claims 11-18.
4. Respectfully traverse all prior art rejections.

B. THE CLAIM AMENDMENTS AND NEW CLAIMS

Claims 3, 5, and 8 have been amended to avoid means plus function terminology.

Claims 5 and 8 have been amended to moot the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, e.g., the allegation that the word “narrow” is indefinite. In this regard, amended independent claim 5 deletes the word “narrow”. Amended claim 8 describes the auxiliary capacity wiring as having a narrower line width at an intersection with a source line than a line width in a pixel pattern.

New independent claim 11 requires that aperture sections be chosen to maintain, below a predetermined crosstalk value, any crosstalk caused by diffraction of light which has passed through the display image separator and into the aperture sections. For support, see specification page 6, for example.

New independent claim 15 resembles new independent claim 11, but recites a parameter of the auxiliary capacity lines rather than of the aperture sections. For support, see specification page 22, for example.

New independent claim 18 includes a limitation of a shield configured to block potential crosstalk-causing diffraction rays which have passed through the display image separator and into the aperture sections. Support for new independent claim 17 is manifest throughout the specification.

C. PATENTABILITY OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 3-5 and 7-10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7,113,158 to Fujiwara et al in view of U.S. Patent 7,446,733 to Hirimai and further in view of U.S. Publication 2007/0152934 to Maeda. All prior art rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

The subject matter of the independent claims is generally directed to prevention of crosstalk in a 3D display apparatus, especially crosstalk due to diffraction phenomenon caused at narrow gap sections included in a pixel pattern (see, for example, paragraphs [0011] through [0013] of the specification).

Of the narrow gap sections causing the aforementioned crosstalk, the largest one is formed due to the shape of the auxiliary capacitor wiring. The inventors have specifically determined finding that narrow gap sections are created in a pixel pattern by the shape of the auxiliary capacitor wiring, and the diffraction phenomenon at the narrow gap sections thus created causes crosstalk.

U.S. Patent 7,113,158 to Fujiwara appears to be cited merely because it mentions a TFT active matrix LCD (see col. 10, lines 10 – 11). In any event, the office action correctly admits that Fujiwara fails to disclose:

(1) a display image separating means for separating the display image, at one time or in a time division manner, according to a plurality of viewpoints

and

(2) aperture sections in each pixel pattern of the display panel having a width set so as not to fall within a range specified by the following inequality: $2 \mu\text{m} < (\text{minimum width of the aperture sections in the pixel}) < 7 \mu\text{m}$.

The office action then attempts to combine U.S. Patent 7,113,158 to Fujiwara with both U.S. Patent 7,446,733 to Hirimai and U.S. Publication 2007/0152934 to Maeda. Unfortunately, it is not clear from the office action what portions of the Hirimai and Maeda are alleged to correspond to missing features (1) and (2).

For example, the office action cites ¶[0307] of U.S. Publication 2007/0152934 to Maeda. But this paragraph primarily discusses improving aperture ratio by reducing the area by which transistors might obscure light from an organic electroluminescent layer. Applicants fail to understand how Maeda ¶[0307] paragraph teaches or suggests missing feature (2).

Moreover, each of U.S. Patent 7,113,158 to Fujiwara, U.S. Patent 7,446,733 to Hirimai, and U.S. Publication 2007/0152934 to Maeda has different and varying technical objectives.

In rejecting dependent claim 4, on page 4 the office action baldly states that the combination of three references (U.S. Patent 7,113,158 to Fujiwara, U.S. Patent 7,446,733 to Hirimai, and U.S. Publication 2007/0152934 to Maeda) teach missing feature (2) as quoted above. But the office action does not specifically cite support for the missing feature (2) in any one reference. Nor do Applicants understand how the alleged synthesis of three references would somehow result in missing feature (2).

Concerning independent claim 5, the office action makes similar allegations as against independent claim 3, but further adds that U.S. Publication 2007/0152934 to Maeda teaches a light shielding film. In this regard, the office action appears to point to ¶[0252] of Maeda. However, ¶[0252] of Maeda particularly pertains to placement or formation of a light shielding film on transistors 11, and on their lower layer or upper

layer in order to prevent picture degredation due to photoconductor phenomena caused by having light incident on the transistors 11. Applicants submit that that the Maeda light shielding film does not have the same positioning or purpose as the claimed light shielding film.

A feature of independent claim 8 is that the auxiliary capacity wiring has a narrower line width at an intersection with a source line than a line width in a pixel pattern. This feature allows a reduction in negative capacitance by reducing an area of the intersection of the source line and the auxiliary capacitor wiring. None of the applied references teach or suggest such a feature.

The new independent claims 11, 15, and 18 are not believed to be taught or suggested by any applied reference of record. Consequently these claims also (and their dependent claims) are deemed allowable.

D. MISCELLANEOUS

In view of the foregoing and other considerations, all claims are deemed in condition for allowance. A formal indication of allowability is earnestly requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the undersigned's deposit account #14-1140 in whatever amount is necessary for entry of these papers and the continued pendency of the captioned application.

Should the Examiner feel that an interview with the undersigned would facilitate allowance of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /H. Warren Burnam, Jr./
H. Warren Burnam, Jr.
Reg. No. 29,366

HWB:lsh
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100